

REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge the withdrawal of the prior rejections based on Devine (US Patent Number 6,397,242) in view of Patel (2004/0215444) and the prior 35 USC Section 101 rejections. Claims 1-30 remain pending in the present application, and stand rejected under a new references, Devine (US 6397242) in view of Lindwer (US 6349377). Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the arguments presented below.

35 U.S.C. Section 103 Rejections

Paragraph 8 of the above referenced Office Action states that independent Claims 1, 11, and 21 are rejected under 35 USC Section 103 as being rendered obvious by Devine (US Patent Number 6,397,242) in view of Lindwer (US 6349377). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Each of the independent claims recite aspects regarding the micro architecture code with respect to the processor architecture hardware. With respect to Claim 1, Claim 1 recites a method for supporting input/output for a virtual machine, comprising:

executing virtual machine application instructions, wherein the application instructions are executed using micro architecture code of a processor architecture, the micro architecture code configured to feed pipelines of the processor architecture hardware, wherein the micro

architecture code includes an instruction interpreter to execute the virtual machine application instructions;

As explicitly recited in Claim 1, the micro architecture code of the processor architecture includes instruction interpreter to execute the virtual machine application instructions. The micro architecture code is specifically configured to feed pipelines of the processor architecture hardware. Additionally, those skilled in the art are aware that micro architecture code of a processor is not available to programs executing on top of the processor (e.g., x86 architecture, etc.). This micro architecture code is directly processed by the pipelines of the CPU. This is very different from, for example, Java byte code. Similar limitations are included in each of the independent Claims 11 and 21.

Paragraph 5 of the above referenced office action acknowledges that Devine does not show or suggest a micro architecture code instruction interpreter as in the claimed invention.

The above referenced office action relies upon Lindwer to show a micro architecture code instruction interpreter as in the claimed invention, specifically, the Abstract, col. 1 lines 7-31 and col. 3 lines 1-50. However, Applicants traversed by pointing out that Lindwer does not show or suggest a micro architecture code instruction interpreter as in the claimed invention.

For example, the Abstract of Lindwer describes Java byte codes and the execution of native instructions. The Abstract defines the processor having pipelines which need refilling by a plurality of native instructions. Applicants point out that native instructions are not processor micro architecture code instructions. Applicants point out that micro architecture code of an x86 processor is different than the so-called native instructions. Lindwer col. 1 lines 7-31 describes a preprocessor comprising a converter for converting virtual machine instructions from memory into native instructions for execution by a microcontroller core.

As described above, Applicants point out that the so-called native instructions are not micro architecture code of a processor. Lindwer col. 3 lines 1-50 further describes the feeding and re-feeding of native instructions to a processor and the conversion of virtual machine instructions into sequences of native instructions, and further describes the use of the preprocessor in combination with a conventional RISC type pipelined processor (e.g., which commonly does not utilize micro architecture code).

Because of this, Applicant asserts that the native instructions described by Lindwer and Devine are not micro architecture code instructions as described by the present invention as recited in the Claims 1-30.

Consequently, Claims 1-30 are not rendered obvious by Devine in combination with Lindwer within the meaning of 35 USC Section 103.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,
MURABITO, HAO & BARNES

Dated: Oct 20, 2008

/Glenn Barnes/
Glenn Barnes
Registration No. 42,293

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060